JOB COMPATIBILITY CORRELATES OF RESIDENT ASSISTANT WORK BEHAVIOR

A Thesis

by

DARRELL R. LAUGHLIN II

Submitted to the Graduate School

Appalachian State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

July 1998

Major Department: Psychology

JOB COMPATIBILITY CORRELATES OF RESIDENT ASSISTANT WORK BEHAVIOR

A Thesis

by

DARRELL R. LAUGHLIN II

July 1998

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Peter Villanova
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Dr. Alfred Alschuler
Member, Thesis Committee

Dr. Stanley Aschleman
Member, Thesis Committee
Chairperson, Department of Psychology

Dr. Judith Domer
Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

ABSTRACT

JOB COMPATIBILITY CORRELATES OF RESIDENT ASSISTANT WORK BEHAVIOR

Darrell R. Laughlin II, B.S., Appalachian State University

M.A., Appalachian State University

Thesis Chairperson: Dr. Peter Villanova

This research was conducted with a sample of Resident Assistants on a mid-sized university campus to further understanding and application of the Person - Job (P-J) fit approach to personnel selection. In this study I sought to examine the validity of a forced-choice measure of P-J fit in predicting worker behavior. To approach this goal, this project involved creating a forced-choice job compatibility measure and administering the device to the worker sample to investigate employee job satisfaction, performance and contract renewal. Specifically, the hypotheses that job compatibility scores would correlate positively with job satisfaction, supervisory- and customer-based performance evaluations, and actual contract renewal were tested. In addition, I tested the validity of a personality measure capable of representing the "Big Five" personality dimensions and a profile comparison device used to predict job satisfaction, supervisory- and customer-based performance ratings as well as contract renewal over that described by the forced-choice measure alone.

The data supported the hypothesis that forced-choice job compatibility scores would correlate with satisfaction with the work itself, but most other hypothesized relationships were not supported. Investigation of the personality and profile comparison measures indicated that the measures did not possess incremental validity over the forced-choice measure for predicting worker behavior. In fact, the Neuroticism and Extraversion dimensions of the personality measure showed relationships reverse to those hypothesized. This prompted an investigation of possible moderators in the predictor-criterion relationships. Previous research has shown that the relationship between predictors and work behavior has been moderated by the perception of

alternative employment opportunities, and perception of the costliness of exploring those opportunities, (i.e., continuous commitment). A moderator analysis confirmed that for this sample, the relationship between the forced-choice job compatibility scores and several performance criteria, including contract renewal, was moderated by continuous commitment. This finding was not only consistent with previous research findings, but also consistent with the job compatibility framework.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Human resource scholars have long maintained an interest in explaining job behavior and attitudes with reference to the congruence between workers' individual differences and job requirements (Assouline & Meir, 1987; Bernardin, 1987; Holland, 1966; 1985; Moos, 1987; Spokane, 1985). This congruence is often referred to as Person - Job (P-J) fit. Historically, most research involving P-J fit has been focused on the qualifications of applicants to perform the job, such as knowledge, skills, and abilities, with occasional attention to other characteristics such as personality, attitudes, and motivation (Villanova & Muchinsky, 1997). Despite these attempts, assessments of "fit" that go beyond formal qualifications are ubiquitous in actual employment situations. The most widespread employment screening device, the interview, often serves as the primary vehicle for assisting decision-makers about the congruence of an individual's personality, attitudes, and motivation with the job requirements and organizational culture. However, because most traditional interview methods are notoriously unreliable and have marginal validity (Mayfield, 1964; Schmitt, 1976), alternatives to measuring P-J fit have been pursued vigorously during the last 10 years. Recent advances in measuring P-J fit have shown considerable promise as potential selection devices that may augment the predictability of several job-relevant outcomes (e.g., Villanova, Bernardin, Johnson, & Dahmus, 1994).

To further understanding and application of the P-J fit approach to selection, the validity of a forced-choice measure of P-J fit in predicting supervisory- and customer-based performance ratings, as well as actual contract renewal, was examined in this study. In addition, the utility of a personality measure and a profile comparison device used to predict supervisory- and customer-

based performance ratings as well as contract renewal, over that described by the forced-choice measure alone, was tested.

Person-Job Fit

Person-environment fit is said to exist when the capabilities of the person are congruent with environmental demands (e.g. Furnam & Schaeffer, 1984). The statement, "People search for environments that will let them exercise their skills and abilities, express their attitudes and values, and take on agreeable problems and roles" (Holland, 1985, p.4), expresses the central premise of the person-environment fit framework.

Person-job fit is a more domain-specific variant of the person-environment fit concept. Person-job fit is defined as congruence between personal characteristics of an individual and those characteristics present in his/her job. The traditional application of P-J fit encompasses the extent to which an individual's knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA's) match the requirements of the job (Edwards, 1991). As such, it more closely resembles a form of qualifications testing. Unfortunately, selection inventories based on KSA's are not designed to predict new employee reactions to the job and environmental dynamics, and consequently, whether or not the organization will successfully recover recruitment, selection, and training costs per new employee job performance (Villanova et al., 1994). Therefore, organizations have long recognized the need for applicant information beyond an inventory of KSA's that qualify the applicant as capable of doing the job. Moreover, organizations want to know: 1) whether a new hire will remain a member of the organization for an extended period of time, 2) if s/he will conscientiously devote effort to meet organizational goals, and 3) whether the new hire will remain satisfied with the job s/he was hired to perform.

The most widely used selection device, the job interview, serves as a subjective measure of P-J fit designed to address some of the shortcomings of traditional fit assessment that focus exclusively on qualifications. Interview judgments are prone to a host of errors due to interviewer idiosyncrasies, socially desirable responses by job candidates, and candidate enactment of interview "scripts" (Tullar, 1989). Simply put, the interview is a fertile setting for impression management (Fletcher, 1989; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). This desire of candidates to present a favorable image often translates into responses consistent with what the candidate believes will increase the interviewer's perception of agreement between what the candidate wants and the organization has to offer. Though criticized because of their poor reliability and low validity (Mayfield, 1964; Schmitt, 1976), interviews remain the most popular selection device because they are thought to provide an essential complement to the objective information provided by selection devices such a job knowledge and ability tests. The interview endures in this capacity simply because there are few alternative, more objective avenues of gathering this kind of P-J fit information.

Recent developments in P-J fit research, however, include the use of alternative methods that render a more objective determination of fit than that of the interview. These alternative methods also focus on how different dimensions of P-J fit such as personality (Holland, 1966), values (Rokeach, 1973), goals (Pervin, 1983), and preferences (Lofquist & Dawis, 1969) influence worker behavior. Contemporary P-J fit research supports the contention that worker preferences for specific job characteristics are related to job performance, voluntary turnover, and employee attitudes (e.g., Bernardin, 1987; Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990; O'Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991; Spokane, 1985; Villanova & Bernardin, 1990).

Alternative Fit Indices

Measurement alternatives to the interview include personality measures, vocational interest inventories, profile comparison devices, self-report attitude and value inventories, and forced-choice scales. Of these, personality and self-report attitude and value inventories have been the most widely studied and the least useful both scientifically and in practice. First, these inventories measure a small subset of person constructs and considerable care must be taken to identify those constructs that pertain to a specific job. Even when such care is taken, the constructs are person-centered in that they do not describe the person and situation in the same terms. That is, they construe the job environment in human terms, essentially anthropomorphizing it. Although personality inventories are now recognized as having some success in predicting job outcomes, they remain transparent and susceptible to faking.

Despite their potential susceptibility to response distortion, recent research has demonstrated that scores on personality inventories may be related to work outcomes when the inventories are based on careful job analysis information and use personality traits theoretically relevant to success in the job. One large problem previously encountered in the study of personality and job performance was the absence of a manageable taxonomy of traits from which investigators could make informed decisions about their potential relevance for predicting job success. However, personality psychologists now appear to agree that there are five general factors of personality that can account sufficiently for the majority of behavioral differences attributable to personality traits (Goldberg, 1993). These "Big Five" factors include extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience.

There is mounting evidence that personality measures have some utility in personnel selection and that, when personality measures are classified according to the Big-Five, there is a systematic

relationship to a variety of job performance criteria (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Tett, Jackson & Rothstein, 1991). It has been found that some personality measures can significantly increase validities over cognitive measures for the prediction of several job-related criteria (Barrick & Mount, 1991). For example, in their meta-analysis of 117 validity studies, Barrick and Mount (1991) found that conscientiousness scale scores were related to performance for jobs that spanned the occupational spectrum (corrected r from .20 - .23). The remaining four factors were related to performance in some jobs, but not others. What is more encouraging is that these meta-analyses likely underestimate the true validity of personality scores for selection decisions because of the authors' inability to account for several artifacts specific to the studies investigated (e.g., criterion unreliability).

Profile comparison (e.g., Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990) and template matching (Bem & Funder, 1978) are based on Q-sort methodology (Block, 1978; Chatman, 1989; Stephenson, 1953). Q-sort methodology allows a job to be described "directly in terms of the competencies necessary to perform it" (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990, p.650), covering the entire domain of necessary attributes, including elements of P-J fit. Q-methodology allows the job and person to be described in commensurate terms, avoiding an anthropomorphic representation of the job situation. It is also a flexible method that allows representation of both person-job and person-organizational fit. It is also a relatively practical approach as the costs are not high and there is consistent evidence indicating that scores on profile comparison measures maintain concurrent validity for predicting work outcomes.

Despite the apparent promise of these devices, P-J fit inventories have traditionally had limited applicability to personnel selection due to response distortion facilitated by the transparency of the scale, which attenuates their validity for making selection decisions (Anastasi, 1985; Karren &

Graves, 1991). Scale "transparency" is the degree to which respondents may derive information from the measure, which clues them to the most desirable or "correct" responses. Respondents who then wish to appear more desirable to an organization will intentionally distort their responses, falsely representing their abilities, values, and attitudes to be more commensurate with those of the organization. In response to the problems associated with the use of transparent measures, Bernardin (1989) and his colleagues (e.g., Villanova & Bernardin, 1990) have employed an alternate approach to P-J fit involving job compatibility assessment by forced-choice methodology.

Job Compatibility

Job compatibility is defined as the extent to which personal preferences for job characteristics are consistent with the job characteristics actually found in the job (Bernardin, 1987; 1989). By this definition, job compatibility is a "motivational construct of preferential choice" (Villanova & Bernardin, 1990, P.179). Bernardin's approach combines ideographic and nomothetic approaches to study behavior by simultaneously providing a nomothetic context for the comparison of ideographic preferences (Villanova et al., 1994).

Introduced specifically to reduce deliberate rating distortion, forced-choice methodology may possess higher validity than other P-J fit assessment methods in instances where applicants are motivated to distort their responses in order to appear more suited for a job. In all of the following studies involving job compatibility, the authors developed a forced-choice job compatibility questionnaire which incorporated forced-choice tetrads. In a three-step process first conceived by Bernardin in 1987, tetrads were developed based on job pertinent behaviors as assessed by interviews, observation, and job analysis.

Bernardin (1987) first conducted a job analysis to identify key characteristics of the job that fostered a significant positive or negative effect. Once comforting and discomforting characteristics

of the job were identified, a job analyst wrote job characteristic statements similar to those indicated, without exposing an obvious linkage to the job in question. Statements irrelevant to the job under study were then written and evaluated with those relevant to the job. Job analysts then independently reviewed the descriptiveness and validity of the items in terms of job relevance.

The next step involved representatives of the test population rating each characteristic to determine whether the characteristic described the job under study and to also indicate if it was a desirable characteristic of jobs in general. Representatives were asked to rate the desirability and relevance of each characteristic on an interval scale from one (very undesirable/irrelevant) to five (very desirable/relevant).

In the third step, the job characteristics were grouped into four item tetrads, pairing items of equal desirability/undesirability such that two items were descriptive of the job and two items were not descriptive of the job. The result was a tetrad with one relevant desirable item, one relevant undesirable item, one irrelevant desirable item, and one irrelevant undesirable item. Study participants were forced to endorse two of the four items in each tetrad. Responses to the forced-choice compatibility device were scored in the following way. Each irrelevant undesirable item endorsed by the participant was scored one, while each relevant desirable item endorsed by the rater was also scored one. Irrelevant desirable items and relevant undesirable items endorsed by the participant were scored as zero. The scores were then added to produce a composite job compatibility score. The greater an individual's score, the greater their implied compatibility for job characteristics actually present in the job.

Bernardin (1987) first used this forced-choice methodology to assess job compatibility among customer service representatives from a large newspaper. This study brought popular attention to the measurement of job compatibility using a new objective questionnaire. Bernardin used job

incumbents and found significant relationships between the compatibility measure and criteria, including "intentions to leave." Bernardin introduced the possibility that job compatibility could be assessed by objective measures that were not readily susceptible to intentional rater distortion.

A second study by Bernardin (1989) involved development of a forced-choice instrument used to determine compatibility between applicant preferences and actual job characteristics among a sample of fast food chain counter personnel. He reported one-month stability coefficients for the compatibility questionnaire that were approximately (.80). These data suggested that the compatibility scale was measuring relatively stable respondent preferences.

In 1990, Villanova and Bernardin conducted a study with the part-time job of telephone interviewer from a large midwestern public research organization using a forced-choice job compatibility measure and the 16PF measure. Approximately 56 participants provided usable data for the study. The composite compatibility measure successfully predicted "intentions to leave" while actual termination prediction barely reached statistical significance. The analyses indicated that the relationship between compatibility scores and withdrawal criteria were strongly moderated by employee classification. That is, the compatibility scores of employees classified as civil service were not predictive of voluntary termination, $r(27) = .07$, ns, whereas the compatibility scores for student employees were predictive of voluntary termination $r(29) = -.39$, $p < .05$. Civil service employees perceived greater opportunities for promotion, performed better than student employees, and were almost without exception, females, aged 25-40, with a high school education, and who worked to provide a necessary supplement to family income. While this finding was consistent with the job compatibility framework, which maintains that employees who have limited vocational choices are likely to remain in a job despite finding it to be inconsistent with their own proclivities,

these findings also suggested that substantive moderators may strongly influence the relationship between job compatibility scores and criterion scores.

Villanova, Bernardin, Johnson, & Dahmus (1994) conducted a study that further substantiated the validity of the job compatibility framework. This study departed from its predecessors of the person-job fit research tradition in that it utilized applicants, establishing the predictive rather than the concurrent validity of a person-job fit measure. The study was conducted with 217 motion picture theater personnel applicants with administration of the forced-choice questionnaire and verbal and numerical aptitude tests. Villanova et al. found that the forced-choice questionnaire successfully predicted termination while scores on the aptitude tests were more predictive of job performance than scores on the forced-choice questionnaire.

Statement of the problem / Rationale for the Present Study

The goal of the current study, similar to that of Villanova et al. (1994), is to demonstrate a predictive relationship between scores on the forced-choice questionnaire and job performance and turnover. While the 1994 Villanova et al. study did support the utility of forced-choice job questionnaires for predicting turnover, it did not address the question of whether jobs with dissimilar demands, structures or scopes would yield similar results. Despite the validity evidence for the measure in high turnover, entry-level, customer service positions, there is no assurance that scores on a forced-choice device would be predictive of work outcomes in human service positions such as the Resident Assistant job that serves as the focus of this study.

An additional purpose of this research was to provide a further test of the job compatibility framework for assessing P-J fit by including criteria that have heretofore been overlooked. While other studies employed forced-choice methodology to assess P-J fit, no research validated the findings with customer-based performance ratings. Arguably, customer-based ratings are more

common today than they were just a few years ago and their frequency of use will likely increase in the future as performance on more jobs develops a customer focus (Villanova, 1992). Customer-based performance ratings hold some advantages over traditional supervisory ratings in that they control for subordinate and supervisor relationship dynamics and rater job experience with the job being rated. However, the validity of customer-based ratings may also be suspect in cases where the job is poorly understood by the customer. This study will employ both supervisory- and customer-based ratings of performance as criteria.

Contract renewal also served as criteria. No study in the job compatibility literature to date has used contract renewal as a criterion. Contract renewal is another indicator of job attachment and should behave similarly (inversely) to voluntary termination.

Because selection decisions are not based on isolated inferences, this study also included a measure of personality that is capable of representing the Big Five factor structure; a taxonomy that has proved useful in previous investigations of the personality-job performance relationship.

Finally, this study also included a profile comparison measure of person-job fit. It was hypothesized that if the profile comparison measure were constructed to represent person-organization fit then the scores may further augment the predictability of criteria above that achieved by scores on the forced-choice job compatibility measure which focuses more specifically on job attributes.

Hypotheses

Based on the research in which it was found that worker preferences for specific job characteristics influence job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover (Patsfall & Feimer, 1985; Steers & Mowday, 1981; Villanova & Bernardin, 1990), the following hypotheses were tested in this study:

Hypothesis one: Job compatibility scores will correlate positively with job satisfaction. Individuals whose compatibility scores are higher (their preferred characteristics are more consistent with actual characteristics of the job), experience a greater fulfillment of their needs, values, and goals. Having their personal needs met by the job should increase levels of satisfaction with the actual work. Likewise, individuals who do not have their needs met as completely, as indicated by lower job compatibility scores, should exhibit decreased levels of satisfaction with the actual work.

Hypothesis two: Job compatibility scores will correlate positively with (a) supervisory- and (b) customer-based performance evaluations. Employees who demonstrate a greater preference for the actual activities of their job, as indicated by higher compatibility scores, should find enhanced performance in that job to be more intrinsically satisfying and consequently, be willing to exert more effort to perform the job better. Conversely, individuals whose preferences are at odds with the actual characteristics of the job, as indicated by lower compatibility scores, will find enhanced performance of the job to be unsatisfying and will be less inclined to exert the extra effort.

Hypothesis three: Job compatibility scores will correlate positively with actual contract renewal. Individuals whose needs, values, and goals are more completely met (indicated by higher job compatibility scores) should be more likely to reenlist in the position. In contrast, individuals whose needs are not met as completely, as indicated by lower compatibility scores, will be more likely to pursue alternative employment opportunities, hence terminating their employment.

Hypothesis four: Scores on the personality inventory will correlate positively with job performance ratings and contract renewal. Specifically:

Hypothesis 4a: Conscientiousness scores will correlate positively with job performance. Conscientiousness is the extent to which individuals are responsible, dependable, organized, planful

and willing to achieve. The job of Resident Assistant requires attention to deadlines, schedules, planning of activities, and the assumption of personal responsibility for others' successful adjustment to college life. Resident Assistants scoring higher in conscientiousness are expected to perform their jobs to more exacting standards, miss fewer scheduled meetings, follow through more consistently with their job-related intentions, and approach their work in a more deliberate and thoughtful manner. As such, they should receive higher ratings of performance from both supervisors and residents.

Hypothesis 4b: Neuroticism scores will correlate negatively with performance ratings from both sources and will also correlate negatively with contract renewal. Resident Assistants often are required to mediate conflict situations involving residents and oftentimes to serve in the role of counselor. Performance of these roles requires compassion but also an ability to regulate one's own emotional involvement in the issues at stake. Individuals scoring high in Neuroticism are less secure and more plagued by negative emotions than individuals who score low on this factor. The more frequent experience of negative affects such as anxiety, depression, anger, and embarrassment by individuals high in Neuroticism could hinder those individuals' ability to cope in social situations involving conflict. Neuroticism has been linked to irrational beliefs and poor coping skills (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Therefore, it is expected that individuals with lower Neuroticism scores will receive higher ratings of performance from both supervisors and customers and because of their higher performance as well as their ability to cope with the emotional demands of the job and be more likely to renew their contract.

Hypothesis 4c: Extraversion scores will correlate positively with performance ratings from both sources and will also correlate positively with contract renewal. Resident Assistants are frequently required to interact with a variety of individuals throughout the day, often at times that may not be

most convenient or that may be set aside for private study. Moreover, the job often requires individuals to cooperate in team- or group-based activities and to assume a leadership role for these activities, which makes their contact with other group members more frequent and psychologically involving. Individuals scoring high on Extraversion are sociable, friendly, cheerful, and assertive. The combinations of traits expressed in this dimension reflect social competencies necessary for assumption of leadership roles and for successful group interaction. Extraverts have a propensity to be loving, affectionate, and talkative and so individuals with this orientation would seem to experience less stress in social encounters. More extraverted Resident Assistants are expected to receive higher ratings from both rating sources. Actual contract renewal should also be more frequent among extraverts as they often find situations that require interpersonal interaction desirable.

Hypothesis 4d: Agreeableness scores will correlate positively with customer ratings of performance. Agreeableness is defined by such terms as trustful, sympathetic, cooperative, and polite. Possession of this trait would seem to facilitate positive relationships between Resident Assistants and the residents since much of the Resident Assistant's job requires making decisions affecting residents' welfare and accommodating their specific needs and wishes. However, high scores in Agreeableness may also pose problems for Resident Assistants' relationships with their supervisors because they may be unable to make decisions that are unpopular to the residents but perceived as necessary and/or fair by their supervisor. Therefore, it is expected that agreeableness will correlate positively with customer ratings but may bear no linear relationship to supervisory ratings of performance.

Hypothesis 4e: Openness to Experience scores will correlate positively with performance ratings from both sources and will also correlate positively with contract renewal. Resident

Assistants are expected to maintain objectivity while listening to the needs and concerns of their residents. Individuals who score high on Openness to Experience are generally more accepting of novel ideas and viewpoints and entertain unconventional values and beliefs more than their lower scoring counterparts. Resident Assistants who are more conservative and exhibit a narrower scope of interest may find it difficult to listen to residents without attempting to impose their individual values on the residents. In these situations, the Resident Assistant would be viewed negatively by their customers and their supervisor for the inability to effectively perform the objective counseling functions of the position, and as such would be less likely to return to the position. Thus, it is expected that Openness to Experience will correlate positively with supervisor and customer-based performance ratings and contract renewal.

Hypothesis five: Scores on the profile comparison measure will demonstrate incremental predictive validity when added to the prediction of performance ratings and actual contract renewal. Scores on the profile comparison measure should represent a broader contextual "fit" than the more job specific scores of the compatibility device. As such, it should represent a combination of psychological climate (James & Jones, 1974) and culture (Schein, 1992) features perhaps not represented in the compatibility scores and thus should augment the predictability of criteria above the level evidenced by the job compatibility measure alone.

METHOD

Subjects and Setting

The Department of Residence Life, whose purpose is to provide college students residence during the academic year and summer terms, employs a staff of 150 - 160 persons, ranging from professional "central staff" positions to graduate and undergraduate student positions within each residence hall. The subjects for this study were undergraduate students holding the position titled "Residence Assistant" or "RA", a live-in position involving para-professional counseling, discipline, administration, and programming. Across campus, a total of 127 of these positions are occupied, one per floor, in 19 residence halls.

To be considered for this position, candidates must have lived in a residence hall at Appalachian State University for at least one semester and be in good judicial and legal standing (i.e., not on sanction) with the University and the state of North Carolina. Candidates must have a 2.25 cumulative Grade Point Average and are not eligible for employment if they will be participating in student teaching during the employment year. Resident Assistants must carry a minimum of 12 hours but may not exceed 15 hours during a regular term, except with special permission. Once hired, Resident Assistants are contracted for one academic year, with reapplication options for following summer terms and academic years. First-year Resident Assistants are paid a yearly stipend of $3000.00 while second year Resident Assistants earn $3500.00. Resident Assistants participate in one week of intensive training seminars and exercises immediately preceding the fall semester. In addition, Resident Assistants are required to participate in regularly scheduled staff development activities during their term of employment. For this study, information on job

characteristics was collected using frequent incident surveys distributed to current Resident Assistants, interviews with a cross section of current Resident Assistants and Resident Directors, and examination of the position description and a recent job analysis on the position. (see Appendix A for job description)

Predictor Measures

The predictor measures used to test the previously stated hypotheses were a forced-choice job compatibility questionnaire (FCJCQ), NEO-FFI personality measure, profile consistency measure, background information questionnaire, contract renewal records, supervisory ratings of performance, and customer ratings of performance.

Job compatibility. Consistent with the procedure developed by Bernardin (1987), a job analysis was conducted and evaluated with information provided by six subject matter experts (i.e., incumbent Resident Directors, who participate in the recruitment, selection, and training of Resident Assistants, as well as supervise Resident Assistants on a daily basis). Subsequent to the position description information, a questionnaire was administered to incumbent Resident Assistants, during a regularly scheduled staff meeting, which asked them to: 1) list the five activities that you do the most in performing the RA position, 2) list the five most important activities necessary to successfully perform the RA position, 3) list the five most taxing activities of the RA position, and 4) list the five most rewarding activities of the RA position. This voluntary questionnaire as well as information from the subject matter experts was the primary basis for identifying the desirable and undesirable characteristics of the job.

From these input sources, it was determined that the Resident Assistant position could be broken down into performance of the following duties: 1) rote administrative tasks such as filing, filling out two-page floor reports, and filling out resident check-in forms, 2) subjective

administrative tasks such as documentation of violations of the policies and procedures of Appalachian State University and The Office of Residence Life, 3) rote physical tasks, including "keying" residents into their rooms with a master key and conducting health and safety room inspections once per month, 4) engaging in required meetings and group interactions such as weekly staff meetings, biweekly one-to-one meetings with their supervisor, and periodic floor meetings with their residents, and 5) providing information and support to residents of their building as well as their fellow staff members.

Once this information was returned, the job analyst wrote job characteristic statements similar to those reported by the Resident Assistants, without exposing an obvious linkage to the job in question. Statements irrelevant to the job under study were then written and evaluated with those relevant to the job. The job analyst and subject matter experts independently reviewed the descriptiveness and validity of the items. Only items receiving unanimous agreement from all reviewers were deemed valid to appear in the forced-choice job compatibility measure as keyed items.

Next, 13 random representatives (10%) of the test population were solicited to rate each characteristic to determine whether or not the characteristic described the job under study and if it was a desirable characteristic of jobs in general. First, the representatives were asked to rate the characteristics on an interval from one (very undesirable) to five (very desirable). Then these representatives were asked to rate the relevance of each characteristic to the job under study on an interval scale from one (very irrelevant) to five (very relevant). The job characteristics were then grouped into four-item tetrads, pairing items of equal desirability/undesirability such that two items were descriptive of the job and two items were not descriptive of the job. The resulting configuration had each tetrad with one relevant desirable item, one relevant undesirable item, one

irrelevant desirable item, and one irrelevant undesirable item. Study participants were forced to endorse two of the four items in each tetrad. The final tetrads consisted of a total 16 undesirable items and seven desirable items scored in the following way. Each irrelevant undesirable item endorsed by the participant was scored one, yielding a maximum score of 32, while each relevant desirable item endorsed by the rater was also scored one, yielding a maximum score of 14. Irrelevant desirable items and relevant undesirable items endorsed by the participant were scored as zero. The scores were then added to produce a composite job compatibility score. With this configuration, the maximum composite job compatibility score was 46. (see Appendix B for the completed measure)

NEO-FFI Personality Inventory. The NEO-FFI is a 60-item personality inventory that is used to represent the Big Five personality factors. Respondents report their level of agreement to each of the 60 statements on a five point scale ranging from zero (strongly disagree) to four (strongly agree). Costa and McCrae (1992) reported that the reliability of the five personality factors represented on the scale ranged from (.68) for Agreeableness to (.86) for Neuroticism.

Profile consistency. Resident Assistants rank-ordered twelve position descriptors (e.g., honest, friendly, warm, enthusiastic) according to how these terms best describe themselves. Incumbent Resident Directors provided the ranking order key that was used to represent the "position template" most descriptive of the ideal Resident Assistant position. Profile consistency scores are simply the Spearman ranked order coefficient computed between each Resident Assistant's rankings and that of the template for the 12 items.

Criterion Measures

Performance Ratings. The proprietary performance evaluation system currently in use within the Office of Residence Life was used to gather data on Resident Assistant job performance. This

evaluation system includes supervisor (Resident Director) ratings as well as customer (resident) performance ratings. Each supervisor evaluation form consists of 6 categories containing statements describing job relevant behavior. The supervisor is asked to describe the Resident Assistant's performance by responding to the behavior statements within each category on the following scale: not applicable, unsatisfactory, needs improvement, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations. The supervisor also has the opportunity to offer comments on specific strengths and weaknesses in each rated category, of the person being rated (see Appendixes C and D). The customer evaluation form consists of 4 categories containing statements of job relevant behavior. Each resident is asked to describe their Resident Assistant's performance by responding to behavior statements within each category.

The rationale for using the current system was three-fold: 1) it was already a biannually fixture of the department, thus did not subject participants, supervisors, or customers to any additional stress in completion, 2) the performance criteria represented on the measures have been chosen by subject matter experts as those most relevant for the position, and 3) the current system involves immediate supervisor and immediate customer ratings for all positions, which carries the advantage of evaluations which are less susceptible to rater bias.

Contract renewal. Actual contract renewal was assessed by collecting results from the reapplication and placement process held approximately 3 months after the predictors were completed.

Procedure

During a regularly scheduled staff meeting incumbent Resident Assistants were asked to complete the FCJCQ (see Appendix B), profile consistency measure, NEO-FFI personality inventory, commitment questionnaire, and the job satisfaction questionnaire and return them to the

Assistant Director of Residence Life in the envelope provided. Due to the fact that evidence in previous studies supports that personal characteristics may moderate job compatibility relationships (e.g. Villanova & Bernardin, 1990), study participants were also asked to complete a demographic information sheet consisting of the following information: 1) age, 2) major, 3) minor or concentration, 4) academic classification, 5) years in the RA position, and 6) years lived in the residence halls of Appalachian. All of this information was collected by the Assistant Director of Residence Life, coded for confidentiality and subject to data analysis and hypothesis testing.

Confidentiality

Upon receipt of the completed questionnaires, the Assistant Director of Residence Life assigned a 4 or 5 digit identification number to each Resident Assistant response packet and removed any personally identifying information. Once performance evaluations for the current term were conducted, approximately 5 months after the predictor measures were completed, the Assistant Director gathered the evaluation forms of only those Resident Assistants who had earlier completed the job compatibility packet. As before, all personally identifying information on the performance evaluation forms was removed and the identification number previously assigned to each response packet was assigned to the corresponding performance evaluations. Again, the only link between the Resident Assistant and any of these forms was the identification number, which was not accessible by anyone other than the Assistant Director of Residence Life.

RESULTS

Fifty-six incumbent Resident Assistants, 35 of which were female, 21 of which were male, representing 44% of the test population, completed the research materials for the study. Reliability of the predictor measures was calculated using Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha (α). As shown in Table 1, for this sample, the five personality dimension reliability coefficients were (.85) for Neuroticism, (.80) for Extraversion, (.79) for Openness to Experience, (.52) for Agreeableness, and (.89) for Conscientiousness. Male and female participants' scores on each personality dimension of the NEO-FFI were compared to standardized scores for college-aged Five-Factor Inventory participants (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Male participants in this study scored at the 35th percentile on the Neuroticism dimension, 70th percentile on the Extraversion dimension, 64th percentile on the Openness to Experience dimension, 83rd percentile on the Agreeableness dimension and 59th percentile on the Conscientiousness dimension. Female participants in this study scored at the 37th percentile on the Neuroticism dimension, 85th percentile on the Extraversion dimension, 66th percentile on the Openness to Experience dimension, 64th percentile on the Agreeableness dimension and 56th percentile on the Conscientiousness dimension.

The probability of Type I error was set at .05 for statistical analyses, establishing statistically significant correlations as $r(56) \geq |.25|$, $p < .05$, for the sample size of 56. Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the predictor variables used in the research. In addition to the FCJCQ composite scores, which were derived as previously described in the procedure, Table 2 contains scores on each personality scale (i.e., Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness) and the profile comparison rank

Table 1

Reliability and Percentile Rank of NEO-FFI Responses

Variables	Reliability[1]	Percentile rank[2] Male	Percentile rank[2] Female
1 Neuroticism Factor Total	0.85	35th	37th
2 Extraversion Factor Total	0.80	70th	85th
3 Openness to Experience Factor Total	0.79	64th	66th
4 Agreeableness Factor Total	0.52	83rd	64th
5 Conscientiousness Factor Total	0.89	59th	56th

[1] Reliability is reported as Cronbach's coefficient alpha (α)

[2] Percentile rank among college-aged Five-Factor Inventory participants (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations of Predictor Variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 FCJCQ Composite Score	26.48	5.67	-	-.02	.38	.09	.05	.04	.20
2 Neuroticism Factor Total	21.16	8.03		-	-.37	-.26	-.30	-.04	.24
3 Extraversion Factor Total	34.30	6.70			-	.39	.25	-.02	-.01
4 Openness to Experience Factor Total	29.75	6.84				-	.21	-.11	.03
5 Agreeableness Factor Total	32.83	4.35					-	.20	-.02
6 Conscientiousness Factor Total	31.69	7.58						-	.02
7 Profile Comparison Rank Correlations	0.27	0.28							-

$p < .05$ where $r(56) \geq |.25|$
$p < .10$ where $r(56) \geq |.22|$

correlations. As shown in Table 2, the FCJCQ composite score was significantly correlated with Extraversion, $r(56) = .38$, $p < .05$, suggesting that the actual job characteristics are more desirable to extraverted as opposed to introverted individuals. Neuroticism scores showed significant negative correlations with Extraversion, $r(56) = .37$, $p < .05$, Openness to Experience, $r(56) = .26$, $p < .05$, and Agreeableness, $r(56) = .30$, $p < .05$, while Extraversion scores were significantly correlated with Openness to Experience, $r(56) = .29$, $p < .05$, and Agreeableness, $r(56) = .25$, $p < .05$. There were no other statistically significant correlations between the predictor variables.

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the criterion variables used in the research. Job commitment was reported by both job centered affective commitment and continuous commitment, which can be best described as the job commitment one feels as a consequence of their perception of the availability of alternative employment opportunities and the costliness of exploring those alternative opportunities. Job satisfaction was reported through five apriori dimensions: satisfaction with pay, supervisor, coworkers, promotion potential and the work itself. Job satisfaction reliability coefficients for this sample were (.83) for pay satisfaction, (.86) for supervisor satisfaction, (.80) for coworker satisfaction, (.63) for promotion potential satisfaction, and (.58) for satisfaction with the work itself. Supervisors rated employees' performance according to six dimensions: Helping Skills, Administrative Duties, Programming, Discipline/Crisis Management, and Staff Relation. Similarly, customers rated each Resident Assistant's performance along four dimensions: Community Development, Human Relations, Resource, and Policy Enforcement. Contract Renewal was reported as a single dimension criterion coded as one (returned to the RA position) or zero (did not return to the RA position). No distinction was made between voluntary and involuntary turnover.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations of Criterion Variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1 Affective Commitment	2.34	0.64	-	.08	-.01	.36	.47	.10	.51	.08	.08	-.04	.02	-.04	.17	.13	.09	.26	.09	.20
2 Continuous Commitment	1.86	0.46		-	.23	.34	.26	.14	.38	.06	.23	.16	.09	.16	-.05	.30	.10	.18	.19	.12
3 Pay Satisfaction	1.45	0.95			-	.07	-.05	.16	.43	.18	.21	.11	.15	.23	.18	.06	.17	.01	-.01	.07
4 Supervisory Satisfaction	3.09	0.88				-	.34	.08	.41	.00	.07	-.12	-.06	-.08	-.08	.32	.07	.31	.19	.15
5 Coworker Satisfaction	3.23	0.62					-	.29	.30	-.03	-.05	-.13	-.22	-.04	-.09	.21	.04	.15	.29	-.04
6 Promotion Potential Satisfaction	2.38	0.83						-	.28	.10	.23	.14	.03	.06	.05	.20	-.03	.06	.25	.29
7 Work Satisfaction	3.08	0.47							-	.10	.13	-.04	.05	.01	.04	.24	.10	.11	.15	.32
8 Supervisor Rated Helping Skill Performance	3.34	0.35								-	.70	.53	.65	.54	.61	.14	.08	.11	.16	-.02
9 Supervisor Rated Administrative Performance	3.17	0.38									-	.59	.78	.72	.58	.19	.07	.13	.07	.15
10 Supervisor Rated Programming Performance	3.21	0.37										-	.58	.57	.45	.36	.21	.24	.39	.21
11 Supervisor Rated Discipline Performance	3.23	0.35											-	.68	.66	.08	.10	.05	.01	.16
12 Supervisor Rated Communication Performance	3.19	0.37												-	.61	.21	.10	.10	.15	.01
13 Supervisor Rated Staff Relation Performance	3.22	0.35													-	.08	.07	.14	.12	.06
14 Customer Rated Community Performance	3.12	0.30														-	.60	.71	.68	.11
15 Customer Rated Human Relation Performance	3.65	0.23															-	.70	.50	.12
16 Customer Rated Resource Performance	3.44	0.35																-	.62	.01
17 Customer Rated Policy Performance	3.46	0.35																	-	-.01
18 Contract Renewal	0.37	0.48																		-

$p < .05$ where $r(56) \geq |.25|$
$p < .10$ where $r(56) \geq |.22|$

As shown in Table 3, affective commitment scores correlated significantly with supervisory satisfaction, $r(56) = .36$, $p < .05$, coworker satisfaction, $r(56) = .47$, $p < .05$, satisfaction with the work itself, $r(56) = .51$, $p < .05$, and customer-rated resource performance, $r(56) = .26$, $p < .05$. Continuous commitment scores were found to exhibit significant correlations with supervisory satisfaction, $r(56) = .34$, $p < .05$, coworker satisfaction, $r(56) = .26$, $p < .05$, satisfaction with the work itself, $r(56) = .38$, $p < .05$, and customer-rated community performance, $r(56) = .30$, $p < .05$. Affective commitment and continuous commitment were found to be uncorrelated, $r(56) < .08$, ns.

Several satisfaction dimensions were shown to have significant relationships with both supervisor and customer-rated performance dimensions as well as contract renewal. Specifically, supervisor satisfaction was significantly correlated with customer-rated community performance, $r(56) = .32$, $p < .05$, and customer-rated resource performance, $r(56) = .31$, $p < .05$, while coworker satisfaction exhibited statistically significant correlations with customer-rated policy performance, $r(56) = .29$, $p < .05$. Promotion potential satisfaction was significantly correlated with customer-rated policy performance, $r(56) = .25$, $p < .05$, and with contract renewal, $r(56) = .29$, $p < .05$, while satisfaction with the work itself also demonstrated significant correlations with contract renewal, $r(56) = .32$, $p < .05$.

All supervisor-rated performance dimensions exhibited statistically significant intercorrelations ranging from $r(56) = .45$, $p < .05$ to $r(56) = .78$, $p < .05$, while all customer-rated performance dimensions exhibited statistically significant intercorrelations ranging from $r(56) = .50$, $p < .05$ to $r(56) = .71$, $p < .05$. Supervisor-rated programming performance provided the only correlation between the performance rating sources, showing significant correlations with customer-rated community performance, $r(56) = .34$, $p < .05$, and customer-rated policy performance, $r(56) = .39$,

$p < .05$. Satisfaction with the work itself was significantly correlated with contract renewal, $r(56) = .32$, $p < .05$.

Correlations between predictor and criterion variables are reported in Table 4 and serve as the basis for testing hypotheses one through four.

Hypothesis Testing.

To test hypothesis one, in which it was stated that job compatibility scores would correlate positively with job satisfaction, FCJCQ composite scores were correlated with each job satisfaction dimension to assess if individuals who had higher job compatibility scores reported more satisfaction with the work itself and the work environment than did those who had lower compatibility scores. The FCJCQ composite showed statistically significant correlations with satisfaction with the work itself, $r(56) = .29$, $p < .05$, but no statistically significant correlations with any other individual satisfaction dimension or the composite satisfaction score, $r(56) < .21$, ns. Therefore the hypothesis that job compatibility scores are correlated positively with job satisfaction was supported by these findings when examining satisfaction with the work itself, but not when examining the other dimensions of job satisfaction or composite satisfaction.

Hypothesis two, in which it was stated that job compatibility scores would correlate positively with (a) supervisor-based and (b) customer-based performance evaluations was tested by correlating FCJCQ composite scores with total supervisor and customer-rated performance scores to assess if individuals who had higher job compatibility scores also exhibited better job performance than persons who had lower job compatibility scores. The FCJCQ composite scores barely failed to exhibited statistically significant correlations with supervisor-rated administrative performance, $r(56) = .23$, $p < .10$, as well as with supervisor-rated staff relation performance, $r(56) = .24$, $p < .10$. No other supervisor or customer-rated performance dimension was

Table 4

Correlation Between Predictor and Criterion Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1 FCJCQ Composite Score	.26	-.08	.02	.12	.13	.16	.29	.14	.23	-.11	.15	.05	.24	.15	.17	.04	.01	.19
2 Neuroticism Factor Total	.06	-.14	.08	-.18	-.15	-.03	-.04	.16	.32	.25	.38	.28	.15	.08	.05	-.05	-.14	-.15
3 Extraversion Factor Total	.20	.17	.05	.16	.40	.09	.43	-.13	-.16	-.29	-.34	-.28	-.13	.08	.01	-.04	.03	.23
4 Openness to Experience Factor Total	-.08	.22	-.15	-.12	.11	-.18	.01	-.08	-.01	.01	-.12	-.07	-.06	.05	.08	.09	.02	.14
5 Agreeableness Factor Total	.22	.28	.05	.08	.24	.01	.24	.13	-.08	-.09	-.06	-.05	.08	.05	.06	.05	.14	.05
6 Conscientiousness Factor Total	-.09	.05	.05	-.18	-.02	.57	.02	.18	.04	.03	-.08	-.01	-.05	.00	-.18	-.17	.03	.04
7 Profile Comparison Rank Correlations	.06	.31	.18	.04	-.06	.21	.21	.04	.24	.02	.29	.16	.27	-.18	-.21	-.17	-.25	.08

$p < .05$ where $r(56) \geq |.25|$
$p < .10$ where $r(56) \geq |.22|$

Key for Criterion Variables

1 Affective Commitment
2 Continuous Commitment
3 Pay Satisfaction
4 Supervisory Satisfaction
5 Coworker Satisfaction
6 Promotion Potential Satisfaction
7 Work Satisfaction
8 Supervisor Rated Helping Skill Performance
9 Supervisor Rated Administrative Performance
10 Supervisor Rated Programming Performance
11 Supervisor Rated Discipline Performance
12 Supervisor Rated Communication Performance
13 Supervisor Rated Staff Relation Performance
14 Customer Rated Community Performance
15 Customer Rated Human Relation Performance
16 Customer Rated Resource Performance
17 Customer Rated Policy Performance
18 Contract Renewal

significantly correlated with the FCJCQ scores. The hypothesis that job compatibility scores are correlated positively with supervisory- and customer-based performance evaluations was not supported by the findings.

To test hypothesis three, in which it was stated that job compatibility scores would correlate positively with contract renewal, the FCJCQ composite scores were correlated with contract renewal records. The FCJCQ composite scores were not significantly correlated with employee contract renewal, $r(56) < .20$, ns. The hypothesis that job compatibility scores are positively correlated with contract renewal was not supported.

Hypothesis four, in which it was stated that scores on each dimension of the personality inventory would correlate positively with job performance ratings and contract renewal, was tested by correlating scores on each dimension of the NEO-FFI personality with each dimension of supervisor and customer-rated performance ratings and with contract renewal.

Specifically, to test hypothesis 4a, Conscientiousness scores were correlated with each supervisor and customer-rated performance dimension. There were no statistically significant correlations between the Conscientiousness scores and any dimension of performance rated by either the Resident Assistant's supervisor or customers, $r(56) < .18$, ns, thus hypothesis 4a was not supported.

To test hypothesis 4b, the Neuroticism scores were correlated with each supervisor and customer-rated performance dimension and with contract renewal. Neuroticism scores showed significant positive correlations with supervisor-rated Administration, $r(56) = .32$, $p < .05$, Programming, $r(56) = .25$, $p < .05$, Discipline, $r(56) = .38$, $p < .05$, and Communication performance, $r(56) = .28$, $p < .05$. There were no significant negative correlations between the

Neuroticism scores and any other dimension of performance rated by either the Resident Assistant's supervisor or customer, $r(56) < .18$, ns, thus hypothesis 4b was not supported.

To test hypothesis 4c, the Extraversion scores were correlated with each performance dimension as well as contract renewal. Extraversion scores showed statistically significant negative correlations with supervisor-rated Programming, $r(56) = -.29$, $p < .05$, Discipline, $r(56) = -.34$, $p < .05$, and Communication performance, $r(56) = -.28$, $p < .05$. There were no other statistically significant positive or negative correlations between the Extraversion scores and any other supervisor or customer-rated performance dimension, $r(56) < .16$, ns. The hypothesis that Extraversion scores are correlated positively with supervisory- and customer-based performance evaluations was not supported by findings.

To test hypothesis 4d, the Agreeableness scores were correlated with each customer-rated performance dimension. There were no statistically significant correlations between the Agreeableness scores and any customer-rated performance dimension, $r(56) < .14$, ns. Hypothesis 4d was therefore not supported.

To test hypothesis 4e, the Openness to Experience scores were correlated with each performance dimension as well as contract renewal. There were no statistically significant correlations between the Openness to Experience scores and any supervisor or customer-rated performance dimension or contract renewal, $r(56) < .14$, ns, thus hypothesis 4e was not supported.

Hypothesis five, in which it was stated that scores on the profile comparison measure would demonstrate incremental predictive validity when added to the prediction of performance ratings and contract renewal, was subject to a series of hierarchical regression analyses to investigate the incremental predictive validity of the FCJCQ and the profile comparison measures. The analysis involved regressing contract renewal and performance ratings on the appropriate personality

scores, FCJCQ scores, and the profile comparison scores. Specifically, the first analysis involved regressing supervisor-rated performance ratings on each personality dimension, the FCJCQ, and the profile comparison rank correlations. This analysis indicated that neither the FCJCQ nor the profile comparison scores demonstrated predictive qualities for supervisor-rated performance appraisal. The second analysis involved regressing customer-rated performance ratings on each personality dimension, the FCJCQ, and the profile comparison rank correlations. This analysis indicated that the profile comparison scores explained part of the variance in customer-rated performance ratings, $\underline{F}(55) = 0.83$, $\beta = -1.08$, $\underline{t} = -1.99$, $\underline{p} < .05$. The last analysis involved regressing contract renewal on each personality dimension, the FCJCQ, and the profile comparison rank correlations. This analysis indicated that neither the FCJCQ nor the profile comparison scores demonstrated statistically significant predictive validities for contract renewal.

While the composite FCJCQ score correlated positively with work satisfaction, most other hypothesized relationships were not supported. These unexpected weak relationships prompted the researcher to explore possible moderators of the hypothesized relationships. The FCJCQ framework posits that the relationship between job compatibility and contract renewal may be moderated by employee perceptions of alternative employment opportunities. In fact, Villanova & Bernardin (1990) discovered that low correlations between job compatibility and voluntary termination were moderated by perception of alternative employment opportunities and perceived importance of the employee's position as a source of income; i.e., continuous commitment. To investigate continuous commitment as a moderator in the current study, the data was analyzed by a median split of continuous commitment scores such that individuals below the median score were grouped as high commitment and individuals above the median score were grouped as low commitment. Though this scoring may initially seem inappropriate, lower scores represent a

perception of fewer alternative employment opportunities, which necessitates higher commitment to the current employer. Thus, low commitment participants are defined as those individuals who perceive greater alternative employment opportunities and feel that exploring those opportunities would not be too costly.

Table 5 presents the correlations among the predictors and criterion variables for both commitment group levels. Results indicated that individuals whose continuous commitment scores were above the median exhibited higher predictor-predictor, criterion-criterion, and predictor-criterion correlations than their below median, high commitment score counterparts. While the small sample sizes of 26 and 30 for low and high commitment subgroups respectively, made the emergence of statistically significant correlations difficult, the FCJCQ composite score demonstrated stronger correlations with both supervisor and customer-rated performance as well as contract renewal for the low commitment subgroup than for the high commitment subgroup. The most statistically significant differences between correlations emerged with the FCJCQ-criterion correlations. The hypothesized FCJCQ-supervisor-rated staff relation performance correlations showed statistically significant differences, $z(26) = 2.35$, $p < .05$. Most notably, however, the hypothesized FCJCQ-contract renewal correlations showed statistically significant differences between the continuous commitment subgroups, $z(26) = 2.95$, $p < .01$. This finding prompted the re-investigation of hypotheses two and three, specifically for the low commitment subgroup. While results for re-testing of hypotheses two yielded results similar those attained for the entire sample, re-testing hypothesis three revealed that the FCJCQ composite scores were correlated in a statistically significant manner with employee contract renewal, $r(26) = .53$, $p < .02$, for the low continuous commitment subgroup. These findings suggest that the forced-choice job compatibility

Table 5

Correlations Between Predictor and Criterion Variables by Levels of Continuous Commitment

Low Continuous Commitment Subgroup

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1 FCJCQ Composite Score	.39	.21	.16	-.19	.22	.44	.18	.37	.16	.29	.06	.57	.14	.26	.15	.05	.53
2 Neuroticism Factor Total	.14	.00	-.06	-.07	.06	-.12	.15	.37	.47	.50	.39	.25	.38	.27	.26	.08	.13
3 Extraversion Factor Total	-.15	.23	.23	.05	-.10	.43	-.28	-.38	-.37	-.52	-.50	-.07	-.08	-.21	-.22	-.07	.06
4 Openness to Experience Factor Total	-.38	-.23	-.02	-.08	-.27	-.10	-.06	-.05	.06	-.18	-.07	-.12	.03	-.07	-.15	.17	.09
5 Agreeableness Factor Total	.01	.03	-.17	-.03	-.12	.13	.10	-.26	-.39	-.28	-.35	-.06	-.35	-.20	-.18	-.01	-.04
6 Conscientiousness Factor Total	-.21	.03	-.15	-.12	.43	.08	.17	-.16	-.13	-.14	-.18	-.41	-.15	-.27	-.24	-.06	-.12
7 Profile Comparison Rank Correlations	-.16	.14	.07	-.12	.46	.04	.06	.29	.03	.25	.04	.32	-.43	-.21	-.32	-.40	.30

$p < .05$ where $r(26) \geq |.39|$
$p < .10$ where $r(26) \geq |.33|$

High Continuous Commitment Subgroup

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1 FCJCQ Composite Score	.09	-.12	.09	.28	.11	.12	.08	.08	-.40	.01	.03	-.01	.11	.08	-.07	-.04	-.15
2 Neuroticism Factor Total	-.01	.12	-.25	-.21	-.08	.01	.16	.28	.06	.29	.21	.08	-.20	-.14	-.27	-.31	-.37
3 Extraversion Factor Total	.37	-.07	.10	.50	.15	.36	-.05	-.09	-.27	-.26	-.18	-.14	.10	.13	.02	.05	.34
4 Openness to Experience Factor Total	.03	-.12	-.23	.10	-.18	-.07	-.13	-.25	-.07	-.10	-.10	-.01	-.07	.17	.23	-.14	.15
5 Agreeableness Factor Total	.28	.05	.16	.27	.05	.19	.14	-.03	.10	.09	.13	.20	.26	.21	.16	.19	.09
6 Conscientiousness Factor Total	-.05	.05	-.22	-.01	.64	-.07	.18	.17	.16	-.03	.09	.18	.08	-.12	-.14	.07	.15
7 Profile Comparison Rank Correlations	.11	.20	-.04	-.20	.03	.19	-.01	.12	-.04	.32	.24	.29	-.13	-.29	-.12	-.22	-.19

$p < .05$ where $r(30) \geq |.36|$
$p < .10$ where $r(30) \geq |.31|$

Key for Criterion Variables

1 Affective Commitment
2 Pay Satisfaction
3 Supervisory Satisfaction
4 Coworker Satisfaction
5 Promotion Potential Satisfaction
6 Work Satisfaction
7 Supervisor Rated Helping Skill Performance
8 Supervisor Rated Administrative Performance
9 Supervisor Rated Programming Performance
10 Supervisor Rated Discipline Performance
11 Supervisor Rated Communication Performance
12 Supervisor Rated Staff Relation Performance
13 Customer Rated Community Performance
14 Customer Rated Human Relation Performance
15 Customer Rated Resource Performance
16 Customer Rated Policy Performance
17 Contract Renewal

measure is more predictive of supervisor-rated staff relation performance and contract renewal for individuals who perceive the presence of greater alternative employment opportunities.

To further investigate the impact of continuous commitment as a moderator, the data was analyzed in a moderated regression framework. To do this, all data were subject to a regression analysis where contract renewal and performance ratings were examined per FCJCQ scores and continuous commitment scores. The analysis yielded no significant effects with either performance or contract renewal criterion variables.

DISCUSSION

The validity of a forced-choice measure of P-J fit in predicting supervisory- and customer-based performance ratings as well as contract renewal was investigated in this study. In addition, the validity of a personality measure and a profile comparison device used to predict supervisory- and customer-based performance ratings as well as contract renewal, over that described by the forced-choice measure alone, was tested. The findings confirmed that the FCJCQ was correlated with satisfaction with the work itself, but most other hypothesized relationships were unsupported. In light of these results, a closer evaluation of the data is appropriate.

The majority of the predictor variables exhibited logical interrelationships. The reliability of responses to items in each personality dimension was consistent with, or greater than, those found in previous research. The FCJCQ composite score correlated significantly with Extraversion, suggesting that the actual job characteristics are more desirable to extraverted as opposed to introverted individuals. Likewise, Neuroticism scores negatively correlated with three of the remaining four "Big Five" personality dimensions as well as profile comparison scores. Furthermore, Extraversion scores were correlated with Openness to Experience and Agreeableness, suggesting that extraverted individuals tend to exhibit more agreeable and open behaviors.

The majority of the criterion variables also exhibited logical interrelationships. Affective commitment scores correlated with supervisory satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself, and customer-rated resource performance, while continuous commitment scores correlated with pay satisfaction, supervisory satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself, supervisor-rated administrative performance, and customer-rated community

performance. Yet, affective commitment and continuous commitment were found to be uncorrelated.

All satisfaction dimensions demonstrated moderate-to-strong reliabilities and several satisfaction dimensions exhibited logical relationships with both supervisor and customer-rated performance dimensions as well as contract renewal. Specifically, satisfaction with pay was correlated with supervisor-rated communication, and supervisor satisfaction was correlated with customer-rated community performance, and customer-rated resource performance. Coworker satisfaction also exhibited correlations with customer-rated policy performance. Promotion potential satisfaction was correlated with supervisor-rated administrative performance, customer-rated policy performance, and contract renewal. As would also be expected, satisfaction with the work itself and contract renewal were significantly positively correlated. Although the observed relationships between the criterion variables were not as strong as anticipated, the characteristics of these relationships followed projections.

Supervisor- and customer-based performance ratings were consistent between dimensions for each rater group, but inconsistent between rater groups. This may be due to several factors, including effects of supervisor bias, or simply limited knowledge of the job on the part of the customer. As previously mentioned, the validity of customer-based ratings is often suspect in cases where the job is poorly understood by the customer or there is no common frame of reference for the evaluation. In this study, the case may not be so much that the job is poorly understood, but that different facets or dimensions of the position are being rated. In fact, interviews with incumbent Resident Directors revealed a general consensus that customer performance ratings would most likely differ from supervisor performance ratings because performance dimensions represented on the performance evaluation devices were inconsistent between the rater groups and

provided a minimal common basis for evaluation. Specifically, the Resident Assistant's customers primarily rate dimensions of availability, contact and benefit to the residents, while their supervisor rates those dimensions as well as staff, administration and expectation-specific work behaviors.

Even with both predictor and criterion variables essentially exhibiting expected intercorrelations, the predictors did not correlate as hypothesized with the criteria. Perhaps the most notable deviation from an original hypothesis was the statistically significant positive correlation between Neuroticism and four of the six supervisor-rated performance dimensions. In essence, within this sample of college-aged individuals, persons with higher Neuroticism scores tend to perform their position better, as rated by their supervisor, than their low Neuroticism score counterparts. One possible explanation could be that emotionally unstable, or neurotic, individuals seek personal approval from external sources to maintain their self-concept and self worth. In an employment situation, the employee's immediate supervisor is in a position to provide the necessary feedback to bolster the employee's self-concept. In this situation, employees may be motivated to attain higher levels of performance, specifically to gain the approval and praise of their supervisor.

An alternate explanation can be explored by examining male and female participants' scores on each personality dimension of the NEO-FFI as compared to standardized scores for college-aged Five-Factor Inventory participants. Specifically, what do the personality scores of the group tested, as compared to their previously tested college-aged counterparts, indicate when evaluated against emergent predictor-criterion relationships? Recall that male participants in this study scored at the 35th percentile on the Neuroticism dimension and 70th percentile on the Extraversion dimension, while female participants in this study scored at the 37th percentile on the Neuroticism dimension and 85th percentile on the Extraversion dimension. These data indicate that the male and female

participants in the current study are essentially less neurotic and more extraverted than the college-aged norms. Individuals who score lower on the Neuroticism dimension are described as calm, relaxed, and generally worry free. Specifically concerning neuroticism, one could contend that and individual must exhibit some neurotic tendencies (i.e., anxiousness, apprehensiveness, a tendency to worry) in order to maintain a sense of humility and that the absence of that humility is often accompanied by what can be referred to as an unbridled abundance of self-worth and excessive personality. A similar, yet inverse, contention could be held concerning extraversion, whereas for this sample, neuroticism may denote a sense of humility, extraversion may denote more hyper, high-energy individuals who do not demonstrate the attentiveness, introspection and thoughtfulness necessary to perform the Resident Assistant position appropriately. The primary theme in this novel explanation is the notion of preference toward individuals whose personality characteristics are more consistent with the mean behavior in the continuum of each personality trait. Essentially, persons at either end of a personality dimension continuum represent extremes among their population counterparts, and those extremes are found to be undesirable in work situations. The data in this study would seem to support this contention, indicating a preference among supervisors for individuals who demonstrate behaviors more consistent with individuals near the mean score in each personality dimension. In this case, less extraverted individuals, as well as individuals who exhibit more neurotic characteristics among their immediate sample counterparts, alluding to a more salient sense of humility, received higher supervisor ratings.

One further supposition concerning the Neuroticism personality dimension scores is that if, indeed, within this sample of largely calm, rational and worry free college-aged study participants, higher neuroticism scores are indicative of a more salient sense of humility, then scores on the Conscientiousness personality dimension should theoretically show positive relationships with

Neuroticism. The presence of this positive relationship would be in contrast to previous findings, as Neuroticism is generally accepted to exhibit a significant negative relationship with Conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992). In this study, Neuroticism scores correlated negatively with three of the remaining four "Big Five" personality dimensions, but did not correlate in a significantly negative manner with Conscientiousness. The presence of the significant negative correlations found between Neuroticism and Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Extraversion relative to the absence of a significant negative correlation between Neuroticism and Conscientiousness provides some support to this contention.

An explanation for the lack of support for the hypothesized FCJCQ versus supervisor- and customer-rated performance may be inconsistent expectations between rating sources. Specifically, the question of why the FCJCQ scores did not correlate with customer-rated performance evaluations must be addressed. Central to an answer to this question may be the notion of role conflict (Bernardin, 1979; Frost, 1983). In essence, competing messages and expectations expressed or implied by each performance-rating constituency may serve to confuse the Resident Assistant or make them choose to whom they will be loyal. In typical work situations, more often it will be the worker's supervisor, or organization, that will gain the loyalty of the employee. This relatively common work environment phenomenon could explain the absence of the hypothesized relationships between the predictors and customer-rated performance in this study.

A further explanation for some of the unexpected predictor-criterion relationships may largely be attributed to the sample with which this research was conducted. Although the FCJCQ and other predictors are regarded as valid trait measurement devices, there is a good possibility that, within this setting, the situational and developmental dynamics of college-aged individuals may only allow the measurement devices to detect particular characteristic states rather than overall personal traits.

Essentially, responses to predictor measures may be largely dependent on critical incidents or situational events recently experienced by the study participants, and as such do not necessarily represent the overall demeanor, beliefs or preferences of the individual, but rather represent reactions to the events that they most readily recall. A similar phenomenon may be taking place with supervisor- and customer-rated performance, as each constituency group rates the Resident Assistant based on specific critical incidents in their memory rather than rating overall mean performance. Essentially, much of the uncertainty accompanying findings of this study may be attributed to measurement error resulting from the dynamic interplay of each individual's personal traits and the situations in which they are involved.

The unexpected predictor-criterion variable relationships prompted exploration of possible moderators in the hypothesized relationships. In previous research, specifically Villanova and Bernardin (1990), it was determined that continuous commitment moderated work behavior such that employees who perceived greater internal and external employment opportunities received higher supervisory ratings of performance. Further, these substantive moderators strongly influenced the relationship between job compatibility scores and turnover as a function of employee classification. Results of the moderating effects of continuous commitment in the present study are consistent with those in the aforementioned study in many ways. Specifically, the findings in the present study suggest that there is a more pronounced relationship between job compatibility and work behavior, including reenlistment, for individuals who perceived the presence of greater alternative employment opportunities. This was consistent with results reported previously, and with the job compatibility framework, which maintains that employees who perceive limited vocational choices are likely to remain in a job despite finding it to be inconsistent with their own proclivities. In such a situation, the predictive qualities of the forced-choice measure are greatly

reduced because employees feel that they do not have the opportunity or freedom of choice to pursue employment situations which are more consistent with their own beliefs and work preferences. In situations where employees perceive more abundant alternative employment opportunities, however, the forced-choice job compatibility measure demonstrates more significant predictive qualities, consistent with the theoretical framework. Indeed, employees that feel their personality (Holland, 1966), values (Rokeach, 1973), goals (Pervin, 1983), and preferences (Lofquist & Dawis, 1969) are consistent with their position, and feel that they have sufficient vocational alternatives, will be more likely to "exercise their skills and abilities, express their attitudes and values, and take on agreeable problems and roles" (Holland, 1985, p.4).

Considerations for Future Research

Although subsequent moderator analysis revealed relationships consistent with previous findings, the preliminary results of this investigation were unexpected. Several weaknesses in the design and implementation of this project may have contributed to the unexpected results. One of the major weaknesses of the current project was the lack of meaningful distinctions between voluntary job termination and involuntary job termination. It is this researcher's recommendation that future research in this area should include a distinction between voluntary and involuntary turnover in the study sample. In the position under study, there are many situations that would make an incumbent Resident Assistant ineligible for employment for subsequent semester terms. These situations include, but are not limited to: class level ineligibility (i.e., graduation from the university), transfer to another institution, participation in student teaching or other internship, and financial or other personal hardships that necessitate attrition. Future research should incorporate appropriate items to assess eligibility for re-enlistment among the study sample to provide necessary insight into possible motivation for employee attrition.

Another area of improvement for future research in this job compatibility framework is to include more self-report information from the job incumbents. Specifically, job performance self-evaluations on both the supervisor and customer rating forms would be beneficial in discovering possible inconsistencies between the supervisor and customer perception of performance versus the incumbents perception of their own performance. Additionally, this information could be correlated with other pertinent criteria, specifically job satisfaction and commitment, investigating whether a Resident Assistant who views their performance as excellent also reports more satisfaction with their job and commitment to it. Likewise, peer performance evaluation could prove valuable in examining hypothesized relationships as well as novel results.

A further suggestion for future research is for the Resident Assistant's supervisors, the Resident Directors, to complete the NEO-FFI to provide further information that would be beneficial in examining supervisor-subordinate employment relationships. Specifically, this information could be used to explore the possible effects of supervisor-subordinate personality similarity as examined against job performance, satisfaction, commitment, and contract renewal. In previous research the influence of rater-ratee similarity on work behavior has been examined, and although few general trends were observed (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Landy & Farr, 1983), information on supervisor personality characteristics may prove useful in the future in explaining supervisor-subordinate similarity bias within this previous untested sample.

Perhaps the greatest weakness of this project was the small sample size of 56. Though the sample size does not influence the magnitude of the relationships among the variables studied, it does dictate the statistical significance of those relationships, and thus the strength of the inferences based on the data. Indeed, a larger sample size is necessary to more accurately test the viability of the research framework, to make more accurate and meaningful inferences on employee behavior

and to design employment devices to better serve the employing department, it's stakeholders and customers. One way to achieve a larger research sample would be for the Department of Residence Life to take on this project as a trial addition to the selection and evaluation systems currently in use, and to require incumbent Resident Assistants as well as applicants to participate. Greater participation by incumbent and potential employees, in addition to the other aforementioned recommendations, would provide more useful information and the statistical power necessary to derive more meaningful interpretations from the results in this employment setting.

REFERENCES

Anastasi, A. (1985). The use of personality assessment in industry: Methodological and interpretational problems. In Bernardin, H. J., & Bownas, D. A., (Eds.), Personality assessment in organization (pp. 1-20). New York: Praeger Publications.

Assouline, M., & Meir, E. I. (1987). Meta-analysis of the relationship between congruence and well-being measures. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31, 319-332.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big-Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-26.

Bernardin, H. J. (1979). The predictability of discrepancy measures of role constructs. Personnel Psychology, 32(1), 139-153.

Bernardin, H. J. (1987). Development and validation of a forced-choice scale to measure job-related discomfort among customer service representatives. Academy of Management Journal, 30, 162-173.

Bernardin, H. J. (1989). Innovative approaches to personnel selection and performance appraisal. Journal of Management Systems, 1, 25-36.

Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1984). Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work. Boston: Kent Publishing.

Bernardin, H. J., & Bownas, D. A. (Eds.) (1985). Personality assessment in organizations. New York: Praeger Publications.

Bretz, R. D., Ash, R. A., & Dreher, G. F. (1989). Do people make the place? An examination of the attraction-selection-attrition hypothesis. Personnel Psychology, 42, 561-581.

Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A., III. (1990). Measuring person-job fit with a profile comparison process. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 648-657.

Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. Academy of Management Review, 14, 333-349.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Professional manual: Revised NEO personality inventory and NEO five factor inventory. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.

Edwards, J. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration. literature review, and methodological critique. In Cooper, C. L., & Robertson, I. T., (Eds.), International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 283-357). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Fletcher, C. (1989). Impression management in selection interview. In Giacalone, R. A., & Roesenfeld, (Eds.), Impression management in the organization (pp. 269-281). New Jersey: LEA.

Frost, D. E. (1983). Role perceptions and behavior of the immediate supervisor: Moderating effects on the prediction of leadership effectiveness. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 31(1), 123-142

Furnam, A., & Schaeffer, R. (1984). Person-environment fit, job satisfaction and mental health. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 57, 295-307.

Goldberg, L. R., (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. American Psychologist, 48, 26-34.

Holland, J. L., (1966). The psychology of vocational choice. New York: Blaisdell.

Holland, J. L., (1985). Making vocational choices (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

James, L. R., & Jones, A. P. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 1096-1122.

James, L., & Mitchell, T. (1989). Situational versus dispositional factors: Competing explanations of behavior. Academy of Management Review, 14, 330-407.

Karren, R. J., & Graves, L. M. (1991, August). Assessing person-organization fit in personnel selection: An evaluation of alternative techniques. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Miami, FL.

Landy, F. J., & Farr, J. L. (1983). The measurement of work performance, methods, theory and applications. New York: Academic Press.

Lofquist, L. H., & Dawis, R. V. (1969). Adjustment to work. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Mayfield, E. C. (1964). The selection interview: A re-evaluation of published research. Personnel Psychology, 17, 239-260.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 81-90.

Moos, R. H. (1987). Person-environment congruence in work, school, and health care settings. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31, 231-247.

O'Reilly, C. A., III, Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. Academy of Management Journal, 34, 487-516.

Patsfall, M. R., & Feimer, N. R. (1985). The role of person-environment fit in job performance and satisfaction. In Bernardin, H. J. & Bownas, D. A. (Eds.). Personality assessment in organizations (pp. 53-81). New York: Praeger.

Pervin, L. A. (1983). The stasis and flow of behavior: Toward a theory of goals. In Page M. (Ed.), Personality: Current theory and research (pp.1-53). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. New York: Free Press.

Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schmitt, N. (1976). Social and situational determinants of interview decisions: Implications for the employment interview. Personnel Psychology, 29, 79-101.

Spokane, A. R. (1985). Conceptual and methodological issues in person-environment fit research. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31, 217-221.

Stevens, C. K., & Kristof, A. L. (1995). Making the right impression: A field study of applicant impression management during job interviews. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80, 587-606.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. Personnel Psychology, 44, 703-742.

Tullar, W. L. (1989). The interview as a cognitive performing script. In Eder R. W., & Ferris, G.R. (Eds.), The employment interview: Theory, research and practice (pp. 233-245). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Villanova, P. (1992). A customer-based model for developing job performance criteria. Human Resources Management Review, 2, 103-114.

Villanova, P., & Bernardin, H.J. (1990). Work behavior correlates of interviewer job compatibility. Journal of Business and Psychology, 5, 179-195.

Villanova, P., Bernardin, H. J., Johnson, D., & Dahmus, S. (1994). The validity of a measure of job compatibility in the prediction of job performance and turnover of motion picture theater personnel. Personnel Psychology, 47, 73-90.

Villanova, P., & Muchinsky, P.M. (1997). Person-job fit. In Peters, L.H., Youngblood, S.A., & Greer, C.R. (Eds.), The Blackwell dictionary of human resources management. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

APPENDIX A

Resident Assistant Job Description

Office of Residence Life, Appalachian State University

Resident Assistant Job Description

Office of Residence Life, Appalachian State University

GENERAL STATEMENT OF DUTIES:

The Residence Hall program is dedicated to the growth and development of each individual student as a part of the "living/learning" concept at Appalachian State University. It is the responsibility of each staff member to assist residents with personal goals, assume responsibility in group living situation, develop good interpersonal relationships, and work toward establishing a sense of community within the residence hall.

The Resident Assistant (RA) reports directly to the Resident Director/Residence Education Specialist and is a full-time student at Appalachian. The RA is responsible for the effective functioning of living arrangements in their respective residential areas.

BASIC POSITION REQUIREMENTS:

- All RAs are required to successfully complete (with a grade of "C+" or better) the HPC 3400 Resident Assistant Leadership Development Course during the first semester hired.
- A cumulative grade point average of 2.25 is the minimum academic requirement for being an RA and must be maintained.
- Resident Assistants are not permitted to enter into any dual employment (paid or unpaid) situations without a written request to and approval from their Area Coordinator. Unpaid dual employment includes internships and other significant time commitments away from your floor.
- All RAs must attend Staff Development and Training workshops that take place one week prior to the opening of the each semester and throughout the year.
- All RAs will participate in the campus wide RA selection process.
- RAs will comply with all provisions of the position description and be cognizant of probation and dismissal policies.

SPECIFIC DUTIES PERFORMED:

PROGRAMMING

- Provide educational and social programs on assigned floor that relate to the current programming model. RAs will be required to program under hall specific models or the Y.O.S.E.F. Model:

A Responsive Need Program	(1 x Semester)
Staff Partner Program	(1 x Semester)

Staff Theme Week	(1 x Semester)
Passive and/or Community Development Activity	(2 x Month)

- Work with staff to present building wide programs on Diversity, Safety & Security and Substance Abuse per semester. (These programs may be presented by any staff member)

- Encourage an educational environment by assisting students as needed through individual assessments and programming.

- Actively encourage students to initiate hall activities and programs that fall within the current programming model.

- Motivate residents to participate in programs offered by students, staff, and the Resident Student Association.

DUTY/CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

- Share duty coverage with staff team members and respond in an appropriate and timely fashion to emergencies in the hall. Responsible for letting students into their rooms, when locked out, when you are on duty between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

- Know and comply with University policies and procedures and explain and implement them as needed to your resident students.

- Responsible for thorough and accurate documentation of all violations of residence hall policies, regulations and the Code of Student Conduct. Documentation must occur at the time of the incident and must be turned in to the RD/RES as soon as possible and no later than 24 hours from the time of the incident for appropriate processing. Serve as the first level of intervention for minor violations.

- Responsible for staying late, and returning early during breaks, etc. in order to properly open and close the assigned residence hall. Responsible for coverage over breaks as assigned.

- Refer to the Residence Life Staff Manual (in the hall office) for direction and information concerning policies, procedures and the total residence life program.

- Appropriately use Master Keys when in your possession. Refer to Master Key Usage Policy.

MEETINGS

- Support Resident Student Association (RSA) through attendance at meetings and events as well as by encouraging resident involvement.

- Attend all building staff meetings (one per week, each averaging 2 hours) and community staff developments (one per month, each averaging 2 hours).

- Attend all staff training activities, as scheduled throughout the academic year.

- Provide the Resident Director/Resident Education Specialist with information pertinent to the operation and events of the floor, section, or living area through individual supervision meetings and other interactions.

- RAs returning for the third or fourth year will be required to serve on one of the following departmental committees: RA Fall Training, RA Selection or RA Staff Development.

COMMUNITY BUILDING

- Establish good relationships with student in the living area by actively getting to know them early in the semester and making frequent contact with them.

- Promote a sense of community on the floor or living area by encouraging residents to become acquainted with one another and by creating opportunities for them to participate in decisions concerning floor conditions.

- Stress to residents the importance of cooperation and concern for others and actively confront those students who fail to comply with residence hall policies or who violate other residents' rights.

- Recognize potential for individual leadership and growth among residents and lend support for the development of that potential.

- Strive to maintain open lines of quality communication between staff and students.

- RAs are expected to be available to assist residents during the week, evenings, and on weekends as determined by the RD, RES, or AC.

COUNSELING

- Perform as a mediator in conflicts among residents, within the limits of personal capabilities, and when necessary, refer to the Resident Director or Area Coordinator.

- Perform as a para-professional counselor within the limits of personal capabilities and refer students to professional help when necessary.

ADMINISTRATION

- Efficiently perform required administrative duties, such as check-in, check-out, room inspections, maintenance requests, and distribution of bulletins and notices. Refer to the Residence Life Staff Manual for direction/execution of the above duties.

- Turn in paperwork in a timely and accurate manner (i.e.: program planner and evaluations, programming fund receipts, major/minor violation forms, maintenance requests, weekly reports, etc.)

GENERAL

- Act as a positive role model, on and off campus.

- Perform other duties and responsibilities, as well as additional expectations as deemed necessary and appropriate by the Resident Director, Residence Education Specialist, Area Coordinator, or the Director of Residence Life.

APPENDIX B

Forced-Choice Job Compatibility Questionnaire

RA Job Characteristics Questionnaire

Office of Residence Life, Appalachian State University

For each set of the four situations listed below, please circle the letters of the two (and only two) situations that would cause you the most ***aggravation*** *or* ***discomfort.***

1. a. Having to handle dirty materials all day.
   b. Seldom being thanked for things you do for others.
   c. Being exposed to smoke or fumes all day.
   d. Not being paid more than those who do the job poorly.

2. a. Working alone all day.
   b. Getting harassed by intoxicated people.
   c. Having little chance of promotion.
   d. Never being given the opportunity to suggest improved ways of doing something.

3. a. Having to watch visual information displays all day.
   b. Having no one at work talk to you.
   c. Being bound by many rules.
   d. Being forced to follow all directives put to you without the opportunity for personal expression.

4. a. Hearing others' complaints all day.
   b. Having a job which requires little work to be done well.
   c. Dealing with irrational people.
   d. Troubleshooting and repairing various mechanical devices.

5. a. Being expected to support ideas that you do not believe in.
   b. Working in extreme heat most of the day.
   c. Working where there is not enough light to see.
   d. Often working more than seven days in a row.

6. a. Being awakened to assist someone.
   b. Having to reason with angry people.
   c. Having to worry about losing your job with no prior notice.
   d. Being expected to cut your hair really short for the job.

7. a. Working in a job that can be emotionally trying.
   b. Earning the same amount as everyone else who does this job.
   c. Having little contact with your supervisor.
   d. Having to wear a uniform to work.

8. a. Being trained to operate machinery.
   b. Working late nights.
   c. Having little contact with co-workers.
   d. Listening to complaints from people all day.

RA Job Characteristics Questionnaire

Remember, for each set of the four situations listed below, please circle the letters of the two (and only two) situations that would cause you the most aggravation or discomfort.

9. a. Being disturbed at home by someone who wants something.
   b. Having to cope with "rush hour" traffic.
   c. Attending meetings in the evening or night.
   d. Being asked to handle blood if someone cuts themself.

10. a. Filing reports weekly on my job activities.
    b. Working with emotional people.
    c. Having to drive around a lot.
    d. Having to perform a job with no supervisor support.

11. a. Having my pay based on how much of something you can sell.
    b. Not being allowed to take on other jobs elsewhere.
    c. Being forced to interact with sick people all day.
    d. Having to work on a rotating schedule.

12. a. Having a supervisor who delegates responsibility and authority to subordinates.
    b. Working with co-workers who do not understand your job.
    c. Turning in a person who broke the rules.
    d. Having to punch in and out on a time card.

13. a. Listening to people who barely speak English all day.
    b. Adapting to changes in work schedules.
    c. Being required to remember detail in a scene.
    d. Having to score answers to questions from an answer key.

14. a. Having to wear a business suit or dress each day.
    b. Being responsible for the safety of others'.
    c. Signing a contract for my job.
    d. Working on a job where your pay is adjusted according to company profits.

15. a. Having several duties expected of you at once.
    b. Frequently having to travel to fulfill work requirements.
    c. Having to exert physical effort on the job, such as lifting 50 pound objects.
    d. Being required to treat others' with respect regardless of their actions.

16. a. Having the same job routine everyday.
    b. Having a supervisor who structures every detail of your work.
    c. Being courteous to people who are not courteous to you.
    d. Having a job which is a lifestyle.

RA Job Characteristics Questionnaire

Now, for each set of the four situations listed below, please circle the letters of the two (and only two) situations that you would find the most <u>comforting</u> or <u>agreeable.</u>

17. a. Frequently interacting with senior citizens on the job.
    b. Attending to the needs of co-workers.
    c. Being paid by the hour.
    d. Interacting with people who are unlike you.

18. a. Communicating with people at a variety of cognitive levels.
    b. Being able to choose the order of job task completion
    c. Dealing with mainly young children.
    d. Working frequently with numbers, including multiplication and division.

19. a. Having to think quickly when making decisions.
    b. Knowing your decisions effect others' lives.
    c. Being required to make a speech to many people several times a week.
    d. Being expected to supervise your co-workers.

20. a. Being required to have an extensive vocabulary.
    b. Being required to write reports clearly and accurately.
    c. Getting docked in pay if you are late for work.
    d. Being able to work at your own pace.

21. a. Analyzing and understanding various personalities.
    b. Having people you do not know tell you about their problems.
    c. Being asked by your supervisors how to do things.
    d. Having to be computer-literate to do your job.

22. a. Having people personally request your assistance.
    b. Having your pay directly affected by how hard you work.
    c. Being responsible for maintaining paperwork.
    d. Having the freedom to leave your work at the office.

23. a. Knowing exactly what will be required of you each day in your job.
    b. Having to take initiative to get something done.
    c. Always having weekends free to do what you want.
    d. Having a variety of tasks to perform for your job.

APPENDIX C

Resident Assistant Performance Evaluation

"Supervisor Evaluation"

Office of Residence Life, Appalachian State University

Revised October 1994
Department of Residence Life
Appalachian State University

To be completed by the:
Resident Director or Residence Education Specialist

Resident Assistant Evaluation

Name of RA:_____Building/Floor:_____

For the purpose of this evaluation, the job responsibilities of the Resident Assistant position have been divided into several main job functions:

Helping Skills and Referral
Administrative Duties
Programming
Discipline and Confrontation
Communication
Staff Interaction

Under each section are individual criteria described with behavior statements. Please respond to these statements by indicating a rating number and by writing comments. Please use the following guidelines when providing feedback on the general skill area you are addressing. Be as specific and descriptive as possible, reflecting the RA's performance and offering suggestions for improvement. Remember that the evaluation process is designed to evaluate the performance, not the personality of the person. Thank you for your time and effort in this process.

Guidelines:

NA = **Not Applicable** (I have not observed this area or do not have first hand knowledge of this skill area.)

1 = **Unsatisfactory** (Employee does not meet minimum expectations in this area and has poor skills and/ or abilities.)

2 = **Needs Improvement** (Employee has minimal understanding of skill area or needs to raise skill level.)

3 = **Meets Expectations** (Employee fulfills normal job requirements and has demonstrated acceptable skills and abilities.)

4 = **Exceeds Expectations** (Employee maintains above average job performance and demonstrates excellent skills and abilities.)

Helping Skills and Referral

A.	Knows residents of floor(s) (i.e., names, interests, personal information/characteristics)	NA	1	2	3	4
B.	Shows interest in residents' needs and problems	NA	1	2	3	4
C.	Is visible and accessible to residents (contacts in a timely manner)	NA	1	2	3	4
D.	Demonstrates knowledge of campus/community resources	NA	1	2	3	4
E.	Makes referrals when necessary and seeks help when appropriate	NA	1	2	3	4
F.	Follows up on resident concerns	NA	1	2	3	4
G.	Practices good listening skills	NA	1	2	3	4
H.	Can be trusted to maintain confidentiality	NA	1	2	3	4
I.	Is accepting of residents' different lifestyles and values	NA	1	2	3	4

Strengths: Needs Improvement:

Administrative Duties

A.	Attends and participates in required meetings (staff, committees, etc.)	NA	1	2	3	4
B.	Is prompt for all required meetings	NA	1	2	3	4
C.	Completes duty expectations	NA	1	2	3	4
D.	Gathers and distributes information to residents in a prompt manner	NA	1	2	3	4
E.	Completes all paperwork accurately and in a timely manner	NA	1	2	3	4
F.	Demonstrates reliability	NA	1	2	3	4
G.	Handles emergencies effectively	NA	1	2	3	4
H.	Attends RSA meetings	NA	1	2	3	4
I.	Attends hall staff development sessions	NA	1	2	3	4
J.	Has attended all community staff development sessions:	NA	1	2	3	4

Date:

Date:

Date:

Strengths: Needs Improvement:

Programming

A.	Plans and implements required programs	NA	1	2	3	4
B.	Utilizes hall, campus, and community resources for programming when appropriate	NA	1	2	3	4
C.	Assess needs of floor for programming	NA	1	2	3	4
D.	Evaluates programs consistently using program evaluation forms	NA	1	2	3	4
E.	Offers programs which foster community and advocate diversity	NA	1	2	3	4
F.	Works to build and maintain community	NA	1	2	3	4
G.	Has completed a minimum requirements as directed by the YOSEF programming model	NA	1	2	3	4

Strengths: Needs Improvement:

Discipline and Confrontation

A.	Responds to incidents in a timely manner	NA	1	2	3	4
B.	Enforces university and residence hall policies	NA	1	2	3	4
C.	Demonstrates consistency in policy enforcement	NA	1	2	3	4
D.	Is firm and fair in dealing with discipline matters	NA	1	2	3	4
E.	Confronts prejudice regarding different lifestyles, racism and sexism when appropriate among floor members	NA	1	2	3	4
F.	Informs residents of policies and their rationale	NA	1	2	3	4
G.	Encourages resident involvement in supporting and enforcing policies	NA	1	2	3	4
H.	Follows up in an appropriate and timely manner with policy violations	NA	1	2	3	4
I.	Models appropriate behavior	NA	1	2	3	4

Strengths: Needs Improvement:

Communication

A.	Promotes and maintains open lines of communication with staff members	NA	1	2	3	4
B.	Holds periodic floor meetings to relay information to residents	NA	1	2	3	4
C.	Checks hall office daily for information (mailbox, duty log, bulletin boards)	NA	1	2	3	4
D.	Keeps supervisor informed (in a timely manner) of floor problems and concerns	NA	1	2	3	4
E.	Follows up facilities concerns in an appropriate manner (i.e. Common Area Reports, Vandalism, Repair Requests)	NA	1	2	3	4
F.	Maintains up to date information boards on their floor	NA	1	2	3	4

Strengths: Needs Improvement:

Staff Interaction

A.	Supports and assists fellow staff members	NA	1	2	3	4
B.	Shows sensitivity to needs and concerns of fellow staff members	NA	1	2	3	4
C.	Is attentive at staff meetings	NA	1	2	3	4
D.	Confronts and offers constructive feedback to staff members	NA	1	2	3	4
E.	Works effectively as a team member	NA	1	2	3	4
F.	Provides constructive feedback to supervisor when appropriate	NA	1	2	3	4
G.	Supports other staff members programming efforts	NA	1	2	3	4
H.	Demonstrates positive attitude while attending staff development ctivities	NA	1	2	3	4

Strengths: Needs Improvement:

Summary Comments

RA's strengths are:

RA needs improvement in the following areas:

Positive aspects of our working relationship:

Aspects of our working relationship that need improvement:

Other:

****

RA's comments on feedback and evaluation session:

My supervisor can help me improve by:

****

RA Signature:_____Date:_____

RD/RES Signature: _____Date:_____

AC Signature:_____Date:_____

APPENDIX D

Resident Assistant Performance Evaluation

"Customer Evaluation"

Office of Residence Life, Appalachian State University

Appalachian State University
Office of Residence Life Evaluation

Resident Assistant Evaluation

Dear Resident Student,

The Office of Residence Life is now evaluation our Resident Assistant staff and would like to extend to you this opportunity to indicate your objective opinions related to the performance of your RA. The results of this evaluation will contribute to the overall growth and development of your Resident Assistant as well as the entire Residence Life Program at ASU. We care about how you feel and are continually striving to improve services and programs. Please take a few minutes to complete this evaluation and return it.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Please fill in your RA's name _____ Floor ____ Date _____

Please respond by checking the response that reflects you opinion:

How well do you know your RA?

___ A. Very Well
___ B. Fairly Well
___ C. Not Very Well
___ D. Not at All

(Circle one response for each statement and please add comments where requested)

1. My RA makes a sincere attempt to know the members of our floor.
   Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
   Comments:

2. My RA encourages me to confront neighbors if they are being loud or disturbing me.
   Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
   Comments:

3. My RA consistently supports, enforces and abides by university rules and regulations.
   Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
   Comments:

4. My RA keeps me aware of official university information and events.
   Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
   Comments:

5. My RA can be trusted with confidential information.
   Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
   Comments:

6. If my RA is not there he / she gets back to me.
   Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
   Comments:

7. My RA treats me with respect.
   Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
   Comments:

8. I respect my RA for the job he / she does.
   Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
   Comments:

9. My RA has tried to encourage an educational environment on my floor by maintaining good study conditions, participation in discussions, and providing educational programs.
   Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
   Comments:

10. My RA encourages me to be involved in floor / hall activities and functions.
    Excellent Good Adequate Needs Improvement Poor No Basis
    Comments:

11. How would you describe your RA?
    Comments:

12. In what capacity have you had contact or interacted with your RA?
    (Circle those words that apply).

As a resource	As an administrator	As a mediator
Friend	As a big sister / brother	_____
An acquaintance	As a counselor	_____

13. How do you perceive you relationship with the staff (RD / RC, RA's, Desk Assistants, Residence Hall Security)?
    Comments:

14. In what ways have you participated as a responsible community member on your floor (attending programs, confronting noise, involvement with RSA, etc.)? If not, why have you not participated on the floor?
    Comments:

VITA

Darrell Ray Laughlin II was born in Asheboro, North Carolina, on February 22, 1972. He attended elementary schools in that area and graduated from Southwestern Randolph High School in June 1990. The following August he entered Appalachian State University and began coursework toward a Bachelor of Science degree. In May of 1994, he received a Bachelor of Science degree in Industrial Technology with a concentration in Electronics. In the Fall of 1994, he entered Appalachian State University once again to begin preparatory work for entering a Master's degree program. In the Fall of 1995, he entered the Industrial/Organizational Psychology – Human Resource Management interdisciplinary graduate program.

The author is heavily involved with the Office of Residence Life, is a member of National Residence Hall Honorary and several other campus and regional organizations. Mr. Laughlin's address is Post Office Box 3672, Boone, North Carolina. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Darrell R. Laughlin I of Asheboro, North Carolina. In June of 1996, Mr. Laughlin married the former Ms. Juliet Fleming of Wilmington, North Carolina.